1 more goofy than the 50 percent applying to the 2 fiber. As worded here, the overall system 3 facilities at 50 percent and relating back to this 4 | particular example, that could require to us build 5 new conduit when it's 50 percent. That's the implication I got from your example.

So, having this overall 50 percent applied to all these many, many different piece parts, 9 there are electronics and fiber and different types 10 of IOF circuits and conduit and you name it, to me that's just something I can't deliver on and kind of just crazy to have in the contract.

7

13

15

19

MR. MONROE: So, it's not your understanding that Verizon could comply with the language proposed by WorldCom in your example by doing the electronics changeouts and having the end 17 result be that there is less than 50 percent 18 | facility utilization?

It's not clear to me at all MR. ALBERT: 20 with all the zillion numerous possibilities how we 21∥would universally comply with this proposed 22 | language that says that we have to provide relief

1 when the overall system facility is at 50 percent. 2 Thank you. I have no more MR. MONROE: 3 questions. 4 MR. EDWARDS: I think Mr. Albert's made 5 all the points I was going to make in cross. 6 don't have any other questions. 7 Thank you. MR. DYGERT: QUESTIONS FROM STAFF 8 MS. CARPINO: Thank you. I just have a 9 10 few questions for both parties' witnesses. Mr. Grieco, could you explain what the 11 12 | facility augmentation arrangement you have with 13 Verizon in Virginia is today. MR. GRIECO: Well, I don't know that we 14 15 have one, which is the problem. 16 MS. CARPINO: Do you have Interconnection 17 Agreement language with Verizon in any 18 jurisdiction? MR. GRIECO: We have Interconnection 19 20 Agreement language that specifies when they will

> MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 735 8th STREET, S.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003-2802 (202) 546-6666

21 augment trunk groups and what the delivery interval

22 is for delivering those trunks to us, but in most

1 of the older agreements that we have today, there 2 | is always a caveat in that language that says, 3 unless facilities are not available, and that has 4 cost us dearly over the last several years, trying 5 to get trunk augments.

MS. CARPINO: Do you have facilities augmentation language with any incumbent?

6

7

8

11

14

16

19

MR. GRIECO: I don't know all the other interconnect agreement we have with the other 10 carriers. This is my first arbitration.

Okay. Then my next question MS. CARPINO: 12 || you won't be able to answer, which was are you 13∥aware whether this issue has ever been arbitrated?

MR. GRIECO: I assume so, but I don't know 15 that to be fact.

Mr. Albert, are you aware MS. CARPINO: that this issue has ever been addressed before a 18 state commission?

Not in the Verizon East MR. ALBERT: 20 territory that I work within, which would be the former NYNEX and the former Bell Atlantic. 22 can speak relative to the former Bell Atlantic back

3

4

5

8

11

12

13

15

16

17

21

22

to the dawn of time, and I could speak to the former NYNEX territory since about '98, which was when I started working with that after the merger.

MS. CARPINO: Could you tell us where, if anywhere, your process, your current process of facilities augmentation is documented. And is that information available to CLECs?

MR. ALBERT: Probably no to both, in that engineers tend not to document or have documented with a lot of formal methods and procedures the way that they do the job.

I guess the difficulty is when we are talking about a transport facility, that overall transport facility in terms of how we provision it and build it, is made up just of a whole number of different piece parts. It's not a singular item.

So that we will have--if we are talking about fiber-optic transport, we will have the fiber-optic electronics that goes on the end of the fiber. We will have the fiber that carries the signals.

We will then have a variety of different

1 multiplexors, different pieces of electronics, that 2 fall out behind the SONET multiplexors. We will 3 then have a number of different digital 4 cross-connect machines that the signal could pass 5 through and be multiplexed in. We will have 6 hardware in the central offices where the 7 | connections are cabled where we have the DSX and the LGX, which are like distributing frames for VS1 9 signals and for fiber-optic facilities. 10 all involved.

11

12

So, each one of those different things that I mentioned is planned and provisioned and engineered as a separate entity unto itself, so 14∥that they have different relief points, different 15 growth forecasts, and they are--all those pieces 16 are used to provide a number of different services for a number of different customers. If we have an 18 IOF transport facility that the overall large pipe 19 of the OC48 SONET pipe, that would carry just about 20 everything under the sun that we provide for IXCs, 21 for wireless, for CLECs, for our own end users as well as our own internal network.

1

3

5

9

10

11

17

19

21

22

So, what the engineers do, there are engineers responsible for planning and provisioning and having sufficient capacity in place for all those different individual piece parts that I mentioned. There are always current operational practices they apply in terms of looking at demand and looking at growth, and determining when do we need to put more in.

But as far as having that written and documented, we are either--where it would be on a stone tablet that our own engineers would use or that would be available to somebody else, it doesn't exist in that fashion. I can describe what we currently do, and it continually evolves over time based on particular equipment and based on the circumstances and based on needs, but for all those different components there is no one nice, neat engineering encyclopedia.

The closest that we would come is there are some overall engineering guidelines, which I think--

MS. CARPINO: Industry-wide?

MR. ALBERT: No, these are Verizon 2 | quidelines.

1

3

5

14

19

When we had these TELRIC proceedings, I 4 have seen us provide that documentation.

That gets into some of the things I'm 6∥talking about, but it's still pretty broad relative 7 to the basic planning and provisioning and 8 engineering job, but that one document, that's about the only thing in print that starts to touch 10 on in some fairly high level fashion some of these 11 different concepts that relate to all the different 12∥individual network components that are required to 13 build transport facilities.

Thank you. Mr. Grieco, in MS. CARPINO: 15 your rebuttal testimony, which is WorldCom 16∥Exhibit 29, you indicated that Verizon has an 17 | 18-month cycle from initial forecast to facility 18 availability.

I was wondering where that figure comes 20 from.

21 MR. GRIECO: It came from a Power Point 22 presentation that Verizon provided at a forecasting

1 seminar for CLECs in Washington, D.C., probably 2 about two years ago or so, that laid out the 3 timeline for their cycle of when a CLEC sends them 4 the forecasts in February, what they do with them, 5 which basically seem like implied you just kind of 6 \ look at them for the first six months, compare them to the ones they get six months later, to see how 8∥much change has taken brace. Bring it into their 9 forecasting cycle, as Mr. Albert described a couple of weeks ago, how they compile that forecast information from the IXCs, from Verizon themselves, 12 from all the CLECs. By the time it turns into 13 facilities, it's 18 months later from the initial forecast provided from the CLECs.

MS. CARPINO: Mr. Albert, does that sound 16 about right?

15

17

19

MR. ALBERT: In a broad sense, to maybe add a little bit to the question, particularly as it applies to interconnection trunks, the current 20∥intervals that we have which originated out of a 21 collaborative in New York, and which tied back into 22 the New York PSC's development of a forecasting

1 process and development of performance measures and 2 performance standards and also penalties that we pay, if you look at those standard intervals that we have, those intervals for trunks tie back into different categories of which one of the conditions that defines those categories is if the trunks had been forecasted or not.

8

11

19

And the longest interval we have, which is for category five, is the condition where the CLEC orders interconnection trunks, and they have not forecasted those at all, and where we currently do not have facilities in place. And that interval 13 | for that category five which arose out of New York and which we use elsewhere, that is 198 business days, is the interval for provisioning that trunk order where it was not forecasted, and where it rolls in the front door, and we have nothing in That is the longest. 18 place.

Now, that does conflict with what Mr. Grieco is describing. I wouldn't deny that we 21 would probably have had a presentation that might 22||have talked about those time frames, but obviously

1 through the collaborative efforts and through our 2 commitments and through working with the CLECs, we 3 are on the hook to have to deliver in a much 4 \shorter period of time, as long as it is forecasted 5 with that 198 business days being the very longest. 6 I would not at all be surprised with the time 7 || frames that Mr. Grieco mentioned if that, in general, is what we do for ourselves for building 9∥the capacity that we use for--within our own 10 network.

But for CLECs and for CLEC trunks that 12 category five, 198 business days, that is the 13 | longest. Which basically means that's why we got 14 to hoof it to make sure that we get enough stuff in 15 place in time before the orders roll in.

11

16

Thank you. Mr. Grieco, what MS. CARPINO: 17 part of your proposal reflects the current practice 18 between the parties? You indicated that in your 19∥testimony. Exhibit 14, your direct. WorldCom 20∥Exhibit 14. It's something is that Verizon has 21 disputed is not the current practice between the 22 two parties. It's page eight, line six. It may be

elsewhere, but that's the first place I see it.

2

11

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

MR. GRIECO: Well, I think the current 3 practice that we have is to exchange--well, to 4∥submit forecasts to Verizon semiannually and to have joint planning meetings with them, and I know 6 that our provisioning organizations have conference calls on a regular basis to manage the daily workings of our interconnection, so I'm not sure what part of that language -- why that doesn't reflect what we do today. I mean, that's what we 10 do.

Let me ask a more specific MS. CARPINO: question, then.

Would you agree that any language contained in your proposal on this issue, IV-3, is a current practice between the parties.

MR. GRIECO: Basically you're asking is 1.1.6 language is how we do things today?

> MS. CARPINO: Correct.

I do know that regardless of MR. GRIECO: what may or may not be in a current contract, we do 22 work with Bell Atlantic cooperatively and have

1 | joint meetings, especially when we are launching 2 | new switches in our network. We sit down and go 3 over our network plans for those switches with 4 | them. We go over the points of interconnection for 5 that switch and how much capacity we are going to 6 | need and how much trunking we are going to expect 7 | to order with them through that point of order of interconnection for that switch well in advance of 9 the switch being put in the service so they will 10 prepared for our orders when they arrive.

We come to all kinds of agreements during 12 these meetings that allows us to put these switches 13 into service.

11

14

19∥

21

I think the point is that the language 15 does specify that we do want to continue, we want 16 to have joint planning meetings and joint -- and come 17∥to agreement on all these issues, but in the case 18 where we can't, there has to be some fallback language that says what dictates when we can't 20 agree.

I think by that we are saying 50 percent 22 is not the default of every single situation, we

1 are going to be looking for 50 percent, augment of 2 facilities at 50 percent utilization. What we are 3 looking for is to mutually agree on what to do and 4 when to do it, based on our forecast, based on our 5 trended marketing, trended growth, and we need some 6 sort of language there to back it up in the sense that we can't come to some agreement.

What happens today if you MS. CARPINO: don't agree?

7

8

10

11

16

18

MR. GRIECO: We argue for months.

Well, typically, orders are delayed. Wе just don't--we do what we want in terms of ordering 13 circuits through the POI, but if they're delayed 14∥six, eight, ten months from when we had requested 15 them.

MS. CARPINO: What's the practical effect 17∥of that delay--

MR. GRIECO: Well, it prevents the launch of our switch by that many months and their ability 20 to put more service on that switch by that many 21 months, and getting deeper penetration into the 22 local market.

MS. CARPINO: Mr. Grieco, you indicated 1 that Verizon continually augments its own facilities to avoid exhaust, but it won't agree to your proposal to do so automatically once a utilization level is triggered. And you further indicate -- this is in your direct testimony -- that if facilities exhaust, traffic between the parties' networks would be blocked.

Have you experienced a higher blocking rate in Virginia than Verizon has, that you're aware of?

9

11

12

13 |

15

1.8

22

MR. GRIECO: I don't know what Verizon's blocking rate would be, so I would have no way to compare the two.

MS. CARPINO: Is that a good indicator of 16 whether the facilities are exhausted, looking at 17 that metric?

MR. GRIECO: Well, when we can't augment a trunk group that's blocking because there is no facilities available, we have a problem, and we are pretty much--our growth is capped.

MS. CARPINO: Has that happened in

1 Virginia?

19 WorldCom specific--

2.0

22

2 MR. GRIECO: I would have to ask our 3 traffic people specifically where we had that situation. I know there have been several instances where we had a large customer waiting for 6 interconnect trunking to be available, so we could move them to our network, and waited and waited and 8 | in instances lost the customer because we simply couldn't get enough interconnect available 10 to--provision between us and Verizon in a timely 11 | fashion that the customer gave up waiting and 12 didn't come over to our network. That doesn't 13 | necessarily point to blocking, but it points to not 14 | being able to augment the trunk groups or support our marketing forecast and our customer demands. 15 W 16 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Albert, do you know 17 whether the blocking rates are at parity in I don't know. You may not know the Virginia? 18

MR. ALBERT: I don't. I haven't looked at them recently for Virginia.

MS. CARPINO: Okay. Does Verizon report

that in Virginia?

2

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

17!

18

MR. ALBERT: Yeah. I mean, we got 3|performance reports that have the trunk-blocking metrics. Now that they are aggregated, the reports that we do provide, so sort of roll together the aggregate performance for all CLECs, but the data we have to keep track of underneath that is CLEC-specific.

So, I'm not aware of our trunk measures being different anywhere in Verizon East in terms of what we design to, what we monitor, what we operate the network to. The main things we zoom in on are the same.

MS. CARPINO: And is that metric, the blockage, the best indicator of whether facilities 16 ∥are close to exhaustion or need to be augmented, or is there some other metric that we should look at?

MR. ALBERT: I would say the main blocking measure is, which if you have a trunk group that is 20∥a three-month repeater, basically meaning it's 21 exceeded its engineering design for the three-month 22 period, that is the prime indicator of insufficient

1 trunking capacity, and that's the prime measure $2 \parallel$ that we got throughout all the states in the east, and that's the one we pay money on when we miss it.

MS. CARPINO: I have one last question for you, and you may not know it. I'm curious how Verizon--how carriers are assessed for the construction of facilities' augmentations. there a nonrecurring charge to requesting CLECs?

MR. ALBERT: Keep me honest here, but I 10∥think with trunk orders, which is when they say I want a trunk group of so many DS1s between these 12∥two particular switches, I believe there are some nonrecurring charges that kick in under that condition.

As far as do we have any charge for 16 anything weird, extraordinary, special and unique, there aren't any standard charges if those types of things are required.

Thank you. That's all I 19 MS. CARPINO: 20 have.

(Pause.)

4

9

13

14

15

17

21

22

I'm just wondering what MR. STANLEY:

1 interconnection facilities specifically is WorldCom interested in besides trunks.

3

4

5

9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

MR. GRIECO: Trunks aren't facilities. I'm not sure I follow the question.

The question is we have been MR. STANLEY: 6 talking about augmenting interconnection 7 | facilities. What are some types of interconnection facilities that WorldCom would potentially ask to augment?

MR. GRIECO: The interface between our co-lo at the point of interconnection and the LEC's network. If we have a co-location cage in their tandem office, for instance, and we have a DS3 patch panel, referred to as POT bay, outside of our cage where our cables terminate, 48 pair of coax terminate to this panel so Bell Atlantic could hand 16 us DS3s when we order them, we expect there to be enough facilities available on their frame and that they are cabled to our side of the POT bay we had 20∥installed, so that when we go to place an order for DS3 they don't have to scramble around and get some cables installed. Those things are there and

1 available and ready for us based on the forecasts 2 that we have given for our traffic requirements for 3∥the next two years.

4

5 II

6

10

13 |

17

And in a mid-span arrangement, we would, if we had OC48s on each end of that fiber pair and as it started to fill up, we would use more and more OC pairs on that 48. We would want to get another pair of fibers between those two points and put in two more OC48s.

You want to do that based on your trended growth on the current OC48, and we will work cooperatively and jointly to work on a time to do that is. That's a situation if you can't come to disagreement, you have to have some fallback number 15∥in the contract, or you argue about it forever, 16 until you start blocking.

MR. MONROE: Ms. Carpino, you asked a question of Mr. Grieco a question he didn't know 19∥the answer to regarding what we are doing with other ILECS, and Mr. Grieco only works in the Verizon area, and I wonder if you want us to take 22 it as a data request.

1 RECORD REQUEST 2 MS. CARPINO: That would be helpful. 3 you have language similar to what you're proposing here that another incumbent has agreed to, we would like to see a copy of that. We haven't numbered 6 these record requests yet, and perhaps we will make 7 that a record request of Mr. Grieco. Thank you. 8 MR. MONROE: MS. CARPINO: Is there any redirect? 9 None from WorldCom. 10 MR. MONROE: MR. EDWARDS: I have a couple of questions 11 for Mr. Albert. 13 MS. CARPINO: All right. REDIRECT EXAMINATION 14 Mr. Albert, did you hear MR. EDWARDS: 15 Mr. Grieco's testimony regarding WorldCom being delayed eight to ten months with respect to being 17 able to put a switch into service because of lack of facilities? 19 20 MR. ALBERT: Yes. 21 MR. EDWARDS: Do you have any knowledge

MILLER REPORTING CO., INC. 735 8th STREET, S.E. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003-2802 (202) 546-6666

regarding any situation like that?

MR. ALBERT: No.

1

2

3

7

9

13

19

22

Do you have an opinion MR. EDWARDS: regarding whether if an interconnection agreement contained the proposals that WorldCom has made specifically the 50 percent trigger for augmentation that you testified to, would that address the kind of situation at all that Mr. Grieco is talking about?

If the situation he was MR. ALBERT: talking about were to have happened, and if every single of the many, many different pieces of the 12 network, if we actually provided them and added to them at 50 percent, it probably would have made that theoretical hypothetical not happen. 15 you're adding the 50 percent, you are just going to 16 have so much stuff everywhere in terms of being 17 God-awful overbuilt capacity coming out the -- a lot 18 of capacity, you would probably never run out.

On the other hand, though, I know you're 20 going to have the TELRIC portions of this proceeding. Unfortunately, I'm not going to be able to join you all on that, but I will guarantee

5 l

6

7

8 II

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

1 you there will be lots of debates there over the 2 this aspect of utilization rates, and I don't think 3∥in those hearings you're likely to hear a single CLEC saying let Verizon cost out their facilities at 50 percent utilization rate.

MR. EDWARDS: That's all I have.

MR. DYGERT: All right. So, at this point I think we could move on to the remainder of 9 subpanel four, which I believe I listed earlier. gather since Verizon has relatively little on all these issues combined, it probably makes sense to 12 proceed through all of them on cross for both sides instead of going issue by issue, if that's acceptable to all the parties.

> That's fine with WorldCom. MR. MONROE:

MR. EDWARDS: I agree.

MR. ALBERT: Could someone read through the particular issues?

> IV-2, IV-3, IV-4. MR. DYGERT:

MR. EDWARDS: We just did IV-3.

MR. DYGERT: You're right. I apologize.

IV-2, IV-4, IV-5, IV-6, and VI-1(A)